



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|--|-------------|----------------------|-----------------------|------------------|
| 10/821,725 | 04/09/2004 | Dylan Jay | 4002121-A-01-US (Jay) | 1514 |
| 47523 7590 02/21/2008 JOHN C. MORAN, ATTORNEY, P.C. 4120 EAST 115 PLACE THORNTON, CO 80233-2623 | | | | |
| EXAMINER | | | | |
| GAY, SONIA L | | | | |
| ART UNIT | | PAPER NUMBER | | |
| 4183 | | | | |
| MAIL DATE | | DELIVERY MODE | | |
| 02/21/2008 | | PAPER | | |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/821,725

Applicant(s)

JAY ET AL.

Examiner

SONIA GAY

Art Unit

4183

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 09 April 2004.
2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-25 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-25 is/are rejected.
7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 09 April 2004 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/ISD)
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

1. Claims 1, 6, and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Kwak et al. (US 6,457,043).

As to claim 1, Kwak et al. teaches a method for assisting a conference unit in performing participant identification in a conference of a plurality of participants, comprising the steps of: detecting a change in an active participant among a set of the plurality of participants using an endpoint telecommunication unit by the endpoint telecommunication unit (**Fig. 1 20B**) (column 8 lines 9 - 16); and, signaling the detected change to a conference unit (conference manager – **Fig.1 22** and multipoint control unit, MCU, and Speaker ID Service - **Fig. 4 50B** and **52B** column 2 lines 13 – 16; column 10 lines 46 - 47)(column 4 lines 3 – 22).

As to claim 6, Kwak et al. teaches a method for assisting a conference unit in performing participant identification in a conference of a plurality of participants, comprising the steps of: detecting a change in an active participant among a set of the plurality of participants using an endpoint telecommunication unit by the endpoint telecommunication unit (**Fig. 1 20B**) (column 8 lines 9 - 16); signaling the detected change to a conference unit (multipoint control unit, MCU, and Speaker ID Service - **Fig. 4 50B** and **52B** column 2 lines 13 – 16; column 10 lines 46 - 47) (column 4 lines 3 - 22); and, determining a new participant of the set of the plurality of

participants by the conference unit in response to signaled change (**Fig. 5** 208, 210 and column 7 lines 64 – column 8 line 3; column 8 lines 9 - 16) whereby the conference unit processes speech information from only the endpoint telecommunication unit (**Fig. 5** 212, 214 and column 8 lines 34 – 37).

As to claim 11, Kwak et al teaches a system for providing a conference, comprising: a conference unit (multipoint control unit, MCU, and Speaker ID Service - **Fig. 4** 50B and 52B column 2 lines 13 – 16; column 10 lines 46 - 47) ; a system controller (multipoint controller- **Fig. 4** 90 and column 5 lines 7 -10 and multipoint processor - **Fig. 4** 92 and column 5 lines 10 - 14); a plurality of endpoint telecommunication units(**Fig. 3** 20 and column 9 lines 44 - 46); a system controller establishing the conference for a set of participants using a plurality of endpoint telecommunication units (**Fig. 3**; **Fig. 4** and column 6 lines 66 – column 7 line 8; column 7 lines 11 – 21, 41 - 48); one of the plurality of endpoint telecommunication units providing service for a subset of the set of the plurality of participants (**Fig. 1** 20B and column 4 lines 11 - 17); detecting a change in a new active participant of the subset of the set of the plurality of participants (column 8 lines 9 - 16) and signaling the change to the system controller (**Fig. 4** 72, 90, 103, 105 and column 1 line 67– column 2 line 4; column 7 lines 5-6, 17, 27 – 32; column 8 lines 16 - 18) ; system controller responsive to the signaled change to request the conference unit identify the new active participant of the subset of the set of the plurality of participants (**Fig. 4** 72, 90, 103, 105 and column 1 line 67– column 2 line 4; column 7 lines 5-6, 17, 27 – 32; column 8 lines 16 -18); and the conference unit identifying the new active participant and signaling the identity to the system controller (**Fig. 5** 208, 210 and column 7 lines 64 – column 8 line 3; column 8 lines 9 - 16).

Although Kwak et al. does not explicitly state " signaling the change to the system controller after detecting a change in a new active participant of the subset of the plurality of participants or "system controller responsive to the signaled change", it is inherent in a H.323 system and terminal that uses H.245 and T.120 protocol as disclosed in the Kwak et al.(Fig. 4) that a transfer of data across a T.120 data channel must be signaled or messaged to the signal controller(MP - Fig. 4 92) using H.245 control signaling protocol (i.e. openLogicalChannel) that contains information about the media and the receiver as written in the ITU-T H.245 series H recommendation (07/97)(pgs 27 - 32) which is update of the recommendation referenced in Kwak et al. (Kwak: column 4 lines 41 – 44).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 2,7, and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kwak et al. (US 6,457,043) in view of Kardos (US 2005/0135583).

Kwak et al. discloses the claimed invention above, but fails to teach that the step of detecting comprises the step of using speech processing.

However, Kardos discloses a method for identifying a participant in a teleconference (**Abstract**) wherein the step of detecting the identity of one of multiple participants at a given location ([0008]) comprises comparing the live speech from the communications device (

[0018]) to stored voiceprints ([0024]) using a voice recognition module (Fig. 2 210) for the purpose of providing speaker identification to participants in a teleconference where the number of participants exceeds a small number, thus making it difficult to identify speakers ([0002]).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify the invention in Kwak et al. with the invention in Kardos so that the endpoint telecommunication unit registers and stores voiceprints and compares the voiceprints with a voice recognition module for the purpose of identifying the speaker in a teleconference when the number of participants makes it difficult to identify speakers.

3. Claims 3, 8, and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kwak et al. (US 6,457,043) in view of Kardos (US 2005/0135583).

Kwak et al. in view of Kardos discloses the claimed invention above and further discloses that the endpoint telecommunication unit is a telecommunication terminal (Kwak: videophone-column 9 lines 44 - 46).

4. Claims 4 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kwak et al. (US 6,457,043) in view of Kardos (US 2005/0135583), and further in view of Shaffer et al. (US 6,826,159), and further in view of Loveland (US 6,782,413).

Kwak et al. in view of Kardos discloses that the claimed invention above, but fails to teach the endpoint telecommunication unit is a remote switch connecting a telecommunication terminal used by a subset of the set of the plurality of participants to the conference unit.

However, Shaffer et al. discloses a conference call unit that is contained inside of a current PBX, bridge, or other networking device (column 2 lines 50- 53) that performs the method for speaker identification for a conference call (column 2 lines 43 - 46) of using speech

processing to detect changes in the speaker for the purpose of identifying callers in a conference call (column 1 lines 45 – 60).

Moreover, Malcolm et al. discloses a system and method for consolidating telephone calls from more than one individual (local callers – **Fig. 2** 111, **Fig. 3** 311) attached to a PBX or computer and bridge (**Fig. 2** 201 , 205 and column 3 lines 42 – 49; **Fig. 3** 301, 305 and column 4 lines 4 - 5) and a single, remote conference call provider and bridge (**Fig. 2**, **Fig. 3** 103, 105) (**Abstract**) for the purpose of multiplexing the local callers into a single connection (column 3 lines 47-57; column 4 lines 9 - 13) to connect to the conference service provider to reduce costs and conserve resources (column 2 lines 36 – 44).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify the invention in Kwak et al. in view of Kardos with the inventions disclosed in Shaffer et al. and Malcolm et al. as follows: the endpoint terminal disclosed in Kwak et al. is a switch, router or other network processing device such as a PBX or computer and a bridge connected to an external conference call provider and bridge for the purpose of providing a single connection between the local callers attached to the switch and the conference call provider; and, the switch, router, or other device such as a PBX or computer has a conference unit attached to the bridge that is enclosed in the switch, router or other network processing device that performs speech recognition to detect a change in speakers for the purpose of identifying a speaker during a conference call.

5. Claims 5 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kwak et al. (US 6,457,043) in view of Bradley et al. (US 2003/0125954).

Kwak et al. discloses the claimed invention above, but fails to teach the step of detecting comprising determining a use of speakerphone on the endpoint telecommunication unit.

However, Bradley et al. discloses a method and system for adding conference call speaker identification capability to a conference bridge wherein the call server determines if the active line has more than one participant registered such as through use of a speakerphone([0029]) for the purpose of performing voice recognition analysis by comparing the live speech with all of voice prints registered to the speakerphone([0029]).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify the invention disclosed in Kwak et al. with the invention disclosed in Bradley et al. to determine the use of a speakerphone on the endpoint telecommunication device for the purpose of registering and analyzing all of the stored data for participants using an endpoint telecommunications unit to detect a change in an active participant.

6. Claim 15 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kardos (US 2005/0135583) in view of Kwak et al. (US 6,457,043).

Kardos discloses an apparatus for detecting change in an active participant among a plurality of participants at a telecommunication unit, comprising: means for receiving audio information from a plurality of participants (speakerphone- [0018]); and, means for performing speech processing to detect the change in active participant among the plurality of participants(voice recognition module- [0016] [0023] [0024]).

Yet, Kardos fails to disclose means for transmitting a message to conference means indicating the change in the active participant.

However, Kwak et al. discloses means (packet- based network interface - **Fig.2 107**) for transmitting a message to conference means (column 10 lines 10 - 14) for the purpose of indicating the change in the active participant in an apparatus that operates in a packet-based network(column 10 lines 9 - 10).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify the invention disclosed in Kardos with the invention disclosed in Kwak et al. to include a packet network interface with the telecommunication unit as disclosed in Kardos for the purpose of communicating messages from a telecommunication unit that operates within a packet-based network.

7. Claim 16 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kwak et al. (US 6,457,043) in view of Kardos (US 2005/0135583), and further in view of Bradley et al. (US 2003/0125954).

Kwak et al. in view of Kardos and Bradley et al. discloses the claimed invention above and further discloses that the method of detecting and signaling may be implemented as software routines executed by the processor of the endpoint terminal (Kwak et al.: column 9 lines 44 – 50), but fails to teach that processor executable instructions may be stored on a processor executable medium.

However, Bradley et al. discloses that processor executable instructions (program code - **claim 13**) can be stored on a processor executable medium(computer readable medium – **claim 13**) for the purpose for the causing any device with a processor to perform any identified method (**claim 13**).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify the invention disclosed in Kwak et al. with the invention disclosed in Bradley et al. to store the software routines as disclosed in Kwak et al. on a processor-readable medium for the purpose of allowing any endpoint terminal as disclosed in Kwak et al. to perform the claimed method as disclosed above.

8. Claim 17 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kwak et al. (US 6,457,043) in view of Kardos (US 2005/0135583), and further in view of Bradley et al. (US 2003/0125954).

Kwak et al. in view of Kardos and Bradley et al. discloses the claimed invention above and further discloses that the method of detecting and signaling may be implemented as software routines executed by the processor of the endpoint terminal (Kwak et al.: column 9 lines 44 – 50), but fails to teach that processor executable instructions may be stored on a processor executable medium.

However, Bradley et al. discloses that processor executable instructions (program code - **claim 13**) can be stored on a processor executable medium(computer readable medium – **claim 13**) for the purpose for the causing any device with a processor to perform any identified method (**claim 13**).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify the invention disclosed in Kwak et al. with the invention disclosed in Bradley et al. to store the software routines as disclosed in Kwak et al. on a processor-readable medium for the purpose of allowing any endpoint terminal as disclosed in Kwak et al. to perform the claimed method as disclosed above.

9. Claim 18 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kwak et al. (US 6,457,043) in view of Kardos (US 2005/0135583), and further in view of Bradley et al. (US 2003/0125954).

Kwak et al. in view of Kardos and Bradley et al. discloses the claimed invention above and further discloses that the method of detecting and signaling may be implemented as software routines executed by the processor of the endpoint terminal (Kwak et al.: column 9 lines 44 – 50), but fails to teach that processor executable instructions may be stored on a processor executable medium.

However, Bradley et al. discloses that processor executable instructions (program code - **claim 13**) can be stored on a processor executable medium(computer readable medium – **claim 13**) for the purpose for the causing any device with a processor to perform any identified method (**claim 13**).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify the invention disclosed in Kwak et al. with the invention disclosed in Bradley et al. to store the software routines as disclosed in Kwak et al. on a processor-readable medium for the purpose of allowing any endpoint terminal as disclosed in Kwak et al. to perform the claimed method as disclosed above.

10. Claim 19 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kwak et al. (US 6,457,043) in view of Kardos (US 2005/0135583), and further in view of Bradley et al. (US 2003/0125954).

Kwak et al. in view of Kardos and Bradley et al. discloses the claimed invention above and further discloses that the method of detecting and signaling may be implemented as software

routines executed by the processor of the endpoint terminal (Kwak et al.: column 9 lines 44 – 50), but fails to teach that processor executable instructions may be stored on a processor executable medium.

However, Bradley et al. discloses that processor executable instructions (program code - **claim 13**) can be stored on a processor executable medium(computer readable medium – **claim 13**) for the purpose for the causing any device with a processor to perform any identified method (**claim 13**).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify the invention disclosed in Kwak et al. with the invention disclosed in Bradley et al. to store the software routines as disclosed in Kwak et al. on a processor-readable medium for the purpose of allowing any endpoint terminal as disclosed in Kwak et al. to perform the claimed method as disclosed above.

11. Claim 20 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kwak et al. (US 6,457,043) in view of Kardos (US 2005/0135583), and further in view of Bradley et al. (US 2003/0125954).

Kwak et al. in view of Kardos and Bradley et al. discloses the claimed invention above and further discloses that the method of detecting and signaling may be implemented as software routines executed by the processor of the endpoint terminal (Kwak et al.: column 9 lines 44 – 50), but fails to teach that processor executable instructions may be stored on a processor executable medium.

However, Bradley et al. discloses that processor executable instructions (program code - **claim 13**) can be stored on a processor executable medium(computer readable medium – **claim**

13) for the purpose for the causing any device with a processor to perform any identified method (**claim 13**).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify the invention disclosed in Kwak et al. with the invention disclosed in Bradley et al. to store the software routines as disclosed in Kwak et al. on a processor-readable medium for the purpose of allowing any endpoint terminal as disclosed in Kwak et al. to perform the claimed method as disclosed above.

12. Claim 21 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kwak et al. (US 6,457,043) in view of Kardos (US 2005/0135583), and further in view of Bradley et al. (US 2003/0125954).

Kwak et al. discloses the claimed invention above and further discloses that the method of detecting and signaling in the endpoint terminal may be implemented as software routines executed by the processor of the endpoint terminal (Kwak et al. : column 9 lines 44 – 50), but fails to teach that processor executable instructions for both the endpoint terminal and the conference unit may be stored on a processor readable medium.

However, Bradley et al. discloses that processor executable instructions (program code - **claim 13**) can be stored on a processor executable medium (computer readable medium – **claim 13**) for the purpose of causing the conference bridge server for determining the identity of a speaker in a conference call, in specific. (**claim 13**).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify the invention disclosed in Kwak et al. with the invention disclosed in Bradley et al. to store the software routines as disclosed in Kwak et al. on a

processor-readable medium for the purpose of allowing the conference unit to perform the method of determining the identity and processing the speech of the active participant.

13. Claim 22 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kwak et al. (US 6,457,043) in view of Kardos (US 2005/0135583), and further in view of Bradley et al. (US 2003/0125954).

Kwak et al. discloses the claimed invention above and further discloses that the method of detecting and signaling in the endpoint terminal may be implemented as software routines executed by the processor of the endpoint terminal (Kwak et al. : column 9 lines 44 – 50), but fails to teach that processor executable instructions for both the endpoint terminal and the conference unit may be stored on a processor readable medium.

However, Bradley et al. discloses that processor executable instructions (program code - **claim 13**) can be stored on a processor executable medium(computer readable medium – **claim 13**) for the purpose of causing the conference bridge server for determining the identity of a speaker in a conference call, in specific. (**claim 13**).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify the invention disclosed in Kwak et al. with the invention disclosed in Bradley et al. to store the software routines as disclosed in Kwak et al. on a processor-readable medium for the purpose of allowing the conference unit to perform the method of determining the identity and processing the speech of the active participant.

14. Claims 23 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kwak et al. (US 6,457,043) in view of Kardos (US 2005/0135583), and further in view of Bradley et al. (US 2003/0125954).

Kwak et al. discloses the claimed invention above and further discloses that the method of detecting and signaling in the endpoint terminal may be implemented as software routines executed by the processor of the endpoint terminal (Kwak et al. : column 9 lines 44 – 50), but fails to teach that processor executable instructions for both the endpoint terminal and the conference unit may be stored on a processor readable medium.

However, Bradley et al. discloses that processor executable instructions (program code - **claim 13**) can be stored on a processor executable medium(computer readable medium – **claim 13**) for the purpose of causing the conference bridge server for determining the identity of a speaker in a conference call, in specific. (**claim 13**).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify the invention disclosed in Kwak et al. with the invention disclosed in Bradley et al. to store the software routines as disclosed in Kwak et al. on a processor-readable medium for the purpose of allowing the conference unit to perform the method of determining the identity and processing the speech of the active participant.

15. Claim 21 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kwak et al. (US 6,457,043) in view of Kardos (US 2005/0135583), and further in view of Bradley et al. (US 2003/0125954).

Kwak et al. discloses the claimed invention above and further discloses that the method of detecting and signaling in the endpoint terminal may be implemented as software routines executed by the processor of the endpoint terminal (Kwak et al. : column 9 lines 44 – 50), but fails to teach that processor executable instructions for both the endpoint terminal and the conference unit may be stored on a processor readable medium.

However, Bradley et al. discloses that processor executable instructions (program code - **claim 13**) can be stored on a processor executable medium(computer readable medium – **claim 13**) for the purpose of causing the conference bridge server for determining the identity of a speaker in a conference call, in specific. (**claim 13**).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify the invention disclosed in Kwak et al. with the invention disclosed in Bradley et al. to store the software routines as disclosed in Kwak et al. on a processor-readable medium for the purpose of allowing the conference unit to perform the method of determining the identity and processing the speech of the active participant.

16. Claim 24 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kwak et al. (US 6,457,043) in view of Kardos (US 2005/0135583), and further in view of Bradley et al. (US 2003/0125954).

Kwak et al. discloses the claimed invention above and further discloses that the method of detecting and signaling in the endpoint terminal may be implemented as software routines executed by the processor of the endpoint terminal (Kwak et al. : column 9 lines 44 – 50), but fails to teach that processor executable instructions for both the endpoint terminal and the conference unit may be stored on a processor readable medium.

However, Bradley et al. discloses that processor executable instructions (program code - **claim 13**) can be stored on a processor executable medium(computer readable medium – **claim 13**) for the purpose of causing the conference bridge server for determining the identity of a speaker in a conference call, in specific. (**claim 13**).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify the invention disclosed in Kwak et al. with the invention disclosed in Bradley et al. to store the software routines as disclosed in Kwak et al. on a processor-readable medium for the purpose of allowing the conference unit to perform the method of determining the identity and processing the speech of the active participant.

17. Claim 25 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kwak et al. (US 6,457,043) in view of Kardos (US 2005/0135583), and further in view of Bradley et al. (US 2003/0125954).

Kwak et al. discloses the claimed invention above and further discloses that the method of detecting and signaling in the endpoint terminal may be implemented as software routines executed by the processor of the endpoint terminal (Kwak et al. : column 9 lines 44 – 50), but fails to teach that processor executable instructions for both the endpoint terminal and the conference unit may be stored on a processor readable medium.

However, Bradley et al. discloses that processor executable instructions (program code - **claim 13**) can be stored on a processor executable medium(computer readable medium – **claim 13**) for the purpose of causing the conference bridge server for determining the identity of a speaker in a conference call, in specific. (**claim 13**).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify the invention disclosed in Kwak et al. with the invention disclosed in Bradley et al. to store the software routines as disclosed in Kwak et al. on a processor-readable medium for the purpose of allowing the conference unit to perform the method of determining the identity and processing the speech of the active participant.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to SONIA GAY whose telephone number is (571)270-1951. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Thursday from 7:30 AM to 5:00 PM EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Len Tran can be reached on (571) 272-1184. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Sonia Gay/
Examiner, Art Unit 4183

February 6, 2008

/Len Tran/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 4183